

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 6, 22, 25, 28 and 29 have been amended while claims 5, 31 and 32 have been canceled as shown on pages 2-6 of the RCE. In addition, claim 33 has been added.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-22, 25 and 27, 28-32 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-22, 25 and 27, 28-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Scharefer (US Pub 2003/0084429). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested since Scharefer fails to teach or suggest all aspects of subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation*** set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ***The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.*** *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to system and methodology to facilitate navigation for inexperienced and experienced programmers to create user interface automation. To this end, independent claim 1 recites a navigation component that facilitates simulated user interface associated with an automation component based, at least in part, upon information stored in a map information store and information stored in a command information store, ***the navigation component further employs a global information store and facilitates a global variable replacement from a single location and sharing of a common program flow among a plurality of users.*** Also independent claim 22 recites ***modifying the user interface automation without recompilation of executables by storing data, commands and executables separately.*** Scharefer neither teaches nor suggests such novel aspects.

Scharefer provides systems and methods for table driven automation testing for performing functional testing of a software program. The system includes a GUI translator

component to translate one or more GUI maps into a set of database tables, a data input component to facilitate entry and editing of test case data in the tables, and a test engine component for executing the software program based on a test case stored in the tables. However nowhere Scharefer teaches or suggests *the navigation component further employs a global information store and facilitates a global variable replacement from a single location and sharing of a common program flow among a plurality of users and modifying the user interface automation without recompilation of executables by storing data, commands and executables separately.*

In view of at least the foregoing, it is clear that Scharefer fails to teach each and every aspect recited in the subject claims. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scharefer. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Scharefer relates to table driven automation testing for performing functional testing of a software program and does not teach or suggest every limitations with respect to amended independent claim 1 (from which claim 4 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claim 4 is not obvious over Scharefer. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scharefer in view of Minard (US Patent 6,247,020). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Scharefer and Minard either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Minard relates to development system with application browser user interface and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Scharefer with respect to amended independent claim 1 (from which claim 2 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claim 2 is not obvious over the combination of Scharefer and Minard. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scharefer in view of Zimniewiez *et al.* (US Patent 6,744,450), hereinafter “Zimniewiez. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Scharefer and Zimniewiez either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims. Zimniewiez relates to system and method for providing multiple installation actions and does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Scharefer with respect to amended independent claims 1 (from which claim 12 and 13 depend), 22 (from which claim 23 depends) and independent claim 25 (from which claim 26 depends). Thus it is submitted, the subject invention as recited in claims 12, 13, 23 and 26 is not obvious over the combination of Scharefer and Zimniewiez. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP462US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731